

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 were examined in the present application. The Drawings and the Abstract were objected to. Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Yoshihashi (U.S. Patent 4,750,475). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Yoshihashi in view of Nishigaki et. al. (U.S. Patent 4,905,082). Claim 12 was rejected under § 103 over Yoshihashi in view of Green (U.S. Patent 5,928,137). Claim 13 was rejected under § 103 over Yoshihashi in view of Ciarlei (U.S. Patent 5,314,070). Claims 1-11 and 14 were rejected under § 103 over Grabover et. al. (U.S. Patent 5,785,644) in view of Salvati et al. (U.S. Patent 5,373,317) and further in view of Ebling et al. (U.S. 4,934,340). Claims 1-14 have been cancelled hereby without prejudice. Claims 15-27 have been added.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Drawings were objected to as not illustrating elements recited in claims 1 and 14. The cancellation of claims 1 and 14 renders this objection moot. Applicant respectfully submits that each of the elements in claims 15-27 are illustrated in the Drawings. Withdrawal of the objection to the Drawings is therefore respectfully requested.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Abstract was objected to as being a general statement. Applicants have amended the Abstract to more fully describe the present invention as contained in the disclosure. No new matter has been added. Withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract is therefore respectfully requested.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The cancellation of claims 1-14 renders this rejection moot. Applicant respectfully submits that each of new claims 15-27 are fully described in and supported by

the specification. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-14 is therefore respectfully requested.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The cancellation of claims 1-14 renders this rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-14 is therefore respectfully requested.

Cancelled claims 1-14 were rejected over the various combinations of Yoshihashi, Nishigaki, Green, Ciarlei, Grabover, Salvati, and Ebling. As claims 1-14 have been cancelled, these rejections have been rendered moot.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in new claims 15-27 is patentably distinct over the references cited in the Office Action. Each of the independent claims of the present application (claims 15,-17, 20, 21 and 25) require "a proximal open end for inserting the treatment instrument into the channel is provided in a specific location in either in the grip structure or a display frame structure. Specifically, claim 15 requires the proximal open end is "on the frame of the display portion so as to open to the display panel side." Independent 16 requires proximal open end is provided "on the grip portion so as to open to a rear side of the display panel." Independent claim 17 requires that the proximal open end "opens between the grip portion and a frame of the display portion." Independent claim 20 requires that the proximal open end is provided "on a side of the frame." Independent claim 21 requires that the proximal open end is provided "on a base of a grip end of the grip portion." Independent claim 25 requires that the proximal open end is provided "on the frame of the display portion so as to display panel side."

None of the cited references Yoshihashi, Nishigaki, Green, Ciarlei, Grabover, Salvati, and Ebling teach or suggest providing the channel opening on the display frame open to the display panel side as required by claims 15 and 25, on the on the grip portion so as to open to a rear side of the display panel as required by claim 16, between the grip portion and a frame of the display portion as required by claim 17, on a side of the frame as required by claim 20, or on a base of a grip end of the grip portion as required by claim 21. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-27 are patentable over Yoshihashi, Nishigaki, Green, Ciarlei, Grabover, Salvati, and Ebling

As each of the claims of the present application are currently in condition for allowance, such action is earnestly solicited.

Dated: August 17, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

Michael J. Scheek

Registration No.: 34,425

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant